Gui	de for Review of State Citizen Participation	on Plan	Performance]
	gram Participant:	<u> </u>			
Staff Consult	ed:				
Date Plan Wa	as Adopted or Last Amended:				
Name(s) of Reviewer(s):		Date:			
(statu a find the re under addre result	nestions that address requirements contain the cite, regulation, NOFA, or grant agreement). If the ing of noncompliance. All other questions (que quirement) do not address requirements, but are standing the participant's program more fully an assed, could result in deficient performance. Neglin a "concern" being raised, but not a "finding."	ne require estions the included ad/or to id gative co	ement is not met, HU at do not contain the d to assist the review dentify issues that, if nclusions to these qu	JD must e citation er in f not pro uestions	t make n for operly
performance t Plan as requir the Citizen Pa Consolidated Local Govern	This Exhibit is designed to review the State of ascertain whether the program participant and at 24 CFR 91.115. The Exhibit is divided rticipation Plan and Any Amendments; Dev Plan Amendments; Performance Reports; Ciments; Availability to the Public; Access to rticipation Plan.	is follov into nir elopmen itizen Pa	wing its Citizen Par ne sections: Develor nt of the Consolida articipation Require	rticipati opment ted Pla ements	of n; for
Ouestions: A. DEVELO AMENDM 1.	PMENT OF THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PARTICIPATICIPATION PARTICIPATION PARTICIPATION PARTICIPATION PARTICIPATION PARTICIPATION PAR	ON PLA	AN AND ANY		
Did the St provide ci original C [24 CFR 9	ate take the actions described in the Citizen cizens and local governments with an opport tizen Participation Plan or on any substantian [1.115(i)] Basis for Conclusion:	unity to	comment on the	Yes	No

19-1 09/2005

2.			
	Did the State take the actions described in the Citizen Participation Plan to encourage participation by minorities, non-English speaking persons, and persons with disabilities? [24 CFR 91.115(i)]	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
B. 3.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSOLIDATED PLAN		
	Before the State adopted its Consolidated Plan, did the State make available to citizens, public agencies, and other interested parties information that includes: a) the amount of assistance the State expects to receive; and b) the range of activities that may be undertaken, including the estimated amount that will benefit persons of low- and moderate-income, the plans to minimize displacement of persons and to assist any persons displaced, and c) when and how the State will make this information available?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
4.	Did the State publish the proposed Consolidated Plan in accordance with the		
	Citizen Participation Plan and in a manner that affords citizens, units of general local governments, public agencies, and other interested parties a reasonable opportunity to examine its contents and to submit comments? [24 CFR 91.115(i)]	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

5.				
	If the Citizen Participation Plan says the State will publish a summary of the	\neg		
	proposed Consolidated Plan, did the summary:		ш	
	1) describe the contents and purpose of the Consolidated Plan, and	'es	No	N/A
	2) include a list of the locations where copies of the entire proposed			
	Consolidated Plan may be examined?			
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
	Describe dasis for Conclusion.			
6.				
	Did the jurisdiction provide a reasonable number of free copies of the proposed	d		
	Consolidated Plan to citizens and groups that requested it?		Yes	No.
	G 1 1		1 63	140
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
7.				
/.	Did the State hold at least one public hearing on housing and community	\neg		
			Ш	
	development needs before the proposed Consolidated Plan was published for		Yes	No
	comment?			
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			

19-3 09/2005

8.			
	Did the State provide "adequate advance notice" of the Consolidated Plan		
	hearing as described in the Citizen Participation Plan? (Publishing small print	Yes	No
	notices in the newspaper a few days before the hearing does not constitute		
	adequate notice. HUD does not specify the length of notice required, but would		
	consider two weeks adequate.)		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
9.			
	Did the State provide notice of the hearing as described in the Citizen		
	Participation Plan to include sufficient information published about the subject	Yes	N.
	of the hearing to permit informed comment?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
	Describe Dasis for Conclusion.		
10.			
	In accordance with the Citizen Participation Plan, did the State:		
	a) hold the hearing at a time and location convenient to potential and actual	Yes	No
	beneficiaries;		
	b) include accommodation at the hearing for persons with disabilities?		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

11.			
	Did the State meet the needs of non-English speaking residents in the case of		
	any public hearing where a significant number of non-English speaking	Yes	No
	residents were expected to participate?		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
12.			
	Did the State provide a period of not less than 30 days to receive comments		
	from citizens and units of general local government on the Consolidated Plan?	Yes	No
		103	
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
13.			
	Did the State consider any comments or views of citizens and units of general		
	received in writing, or orally at the public hearings, in preparing the final	Yes	No
	Consolidated Plan?	. 33	
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

19-5 09/2005

14.				
	Did the State take the actions described in the Citizen Participation Plan to			
	provide for and encourage citizens, especially low- and moderate-income		Yes	N-
	persons, particularly those living in slum and blighted areas and in areas whe	re	res	No
	CDBG funds are proposed to be used, and residents of predominantly low- are			
	moderate-income neighborhoods, to participate in the development of the	10		
	Consolidated Plan?			
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
	Describe dasis for Conclusion:			
C.	CONSOLIDATED PLAN AMENDMENTS			
15.				
	For each Consolidated Plan amendment, did the State apply the criteria			
	described in the Citizen Participation Plan to determine what changes in the	Ш	ш	
	State's planned or actual activities constitute a substantial amendment to the	Yes	No	N/A
	Consolidated Plan?	Ì		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
	Describe Dusis for Conclusion.			
16.				
	Did the State, in accordance with its Citizen Participation Plan:			
	a) provide citizens and units of general local government with reasonable			
	notice and an opportunity to comment on substantial amendments to the	Yes	No	N/A
	Consolidated Plan;	Ì		
	b) provide reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment; and	Ì		
	c) provide a period, not less than 30 days, to receive comments on the	Ì		
	substantial amendment before any amendments was implemented?	Ì		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
	Describe dasis for Conclusion.			

17.				
	Did the State consider any comments or views of citizens and units of		\Box	
	general local government received in writing, or orally at public hearings, if	Yes	L.	N/A
	any, in preparing each substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan?	Yes	No	N/A
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
18.				
10.	Did the State take the actions described in the Citizen Participation Plan to			
	provide for and encourage citizens, especially low- and moderate-income			
	persons, particularly those living in slum and blighted areas and in areas	Yes	No	N/A
	where CDBG funds are proposed to be used, and residents of predominantly			
	low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, to participate in the development			
	of any substantial amendments to the Consolidated Plan?			
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
	PERFORMANCE REPORTS			
19.				
	Did the State:			
	a) provide citizens with reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment of	n	Yes	No
	performance reports,			
	b) give reasonable notice and an opportunity to comment, and			
	c) provide a period, not less than 15 days, to receive comments on the			
	performance report before its submission to HUD?	\bot		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			

19-7 09/2005

20.			
	Did the State consider any comments or views of citizens received in writing, o	r	
	orally at public hearings in preparing the performance report?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
21.			
	Did the State take the actions described in the Citizen Participation Plan to provide for and encourage citizens, especially low- and moderate-income persons, particularly those living in slum and blighted areas and in areas where CDBG funds are proposed to be used, and residents of predominantly low- and moderate-income neighborhoods, to participate in the development of the performance report?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
E. 22.	CITIZEN PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMEN	<u>NTS</u>	
	For the CDBG program only, did units of general local government	$\overline{1}$	
	receiving CDBG funds from the State meet citizen participation	es No	N/A
	requirements as described in the State Citizen Participation Plan? Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

F. AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC

23.			
	Does the State make the Consolidated Plan as adopted, substantial amendments,		
	and the performance report available to the public, including the availability of	Yes	No
	materials in a form accessible to persons with disabilities, upon request, as		
	described in the Citizen Participation Plan?		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
C	ACCESS TO RECORDS		
u. 24.	ACCESS TO RECORDS		
	Did the State provide citizens, public agencies, and other interested parties with	$\overline{\Box}$	
	reasonable and timely access to information and records relating to the State's	<u></u>	<u></u>
	Consolidated Plan and the State's use of assistance under the programs covered	Yes	No
	in the Consolidated Plan during the preceding five years?		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
	<u>COMPLAINTS</u>		
25.			
	In accordance with the citizen complaint procedures described in the Citizen		
	Participation Plan, did the State provide a timely, substantive written response	Yes	No
	to every citizen complaint related to the Consolidated Plan, amendments, and		
	performance reports within an established period of time?		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

19-9 09/2005

26.				
	For the CDBG program only, did each citizen complaint receive a			
	substantive written response "within 15 working days, where practicable?"	Yes	No	N/A
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			
I.	FOLLOWING THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION PLAN			
27.	·			
	Based on the review documented above, did the State follow its Citizen			
	Participation Plan?		Yes	No
	[24 CFR 91.115(i)			
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:			